Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

### *Drawings*

1.      Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 8/2/2004

2.      In view of amending claims 7-8 [8/2/2004], the objection to claims 7-8 as set forth

in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

3.      The drawings filed on 11/28/2001 are <u>approved</u> by the Draftsperson under

37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

4.      The information disclosure statement filed on 8/2/2004 comply with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 has been considered , a copy of

PTO-1449 is hereby enclosed with this office action.

### *Priority*

5.      Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged

based on Provisional Application Number 60/253,490 filed on November 28, 2000

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6.      Claims 1- 7,10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Drucker et al., [hereafter Drucker], US Patent No. 6292796.

7.      As to Claim 1, 10, Drucker teaches a system which including 'method of using

the Internet to retrieve and handle at least one printed article from a printed publication'

[col 2, line 31-35,line 53-59, col 4, line 23-26, fig 6C], internet to retrieve and handle

printed article from a printed publication corresponds to searching specific article or

information from Internet Grateful Med or IGM as detailed in col 2, line 31-35, line 53-

59;'providing at least one printed article that is to be published in print' [col 3, line 27-31,

col 4, line 8-12 line 23-26, fig 6C]; 'assigning said at least one printed article with at

least one tag' [col 4, line 32-44, col 8, line 37-52], printed article tags corresponds to

series of URLs;; 'publishing said at least one printed article in print with its

corresponding tag' [col 6, line 16-38, col 8, line 37-52, fig 6C]; 'storing said at least one

printed article in a database, said database being searchable based on said at least one

tag' [col 6, line 65-67, col 7, line 1-6, col 9, line 1-8]; ' connecting said database to said

Internet' [fig 8, fig 12, col 15, line 53-59]  database corresponds to fig 8, element 518,

Internet corresponds to fig 12, element 1225; 'receiving a request from an Internet

client, said request including said at least one tag' [col 3, line 27-32,  col 7, line 66-67,

col 8, line 1-5]; 'searching through said database to locate said printed article matching

said at least one tag' [col 8, line 18-26]; 'upon locating said printed article, sending said

printed article to said Internet client' [col 8, line 20-22].


8.      As to Claim 2, 11, Drucker teaches a system which including 'bundling additional

information to said printed article when replying to said Internet client'

[col 8, line 29-34].


9.      As to Claim 3, Drucker teaches a system which including 'bundling additional

information based on profile information supplied by said Internet client'

[col 9, line 15-19].

10.     As to Claim 4, Drucker teaches a system which including 'bundling based on the

profile information supplied by Internet client and subject matter of said printed article'

[col 9, line 37-51].


11.     As to Claim 5, Drucker teaches a system which including 'prior to granting

access to said database to said Internet client, pre-registering said Internet client for

authentication [col 4, line 27-35, col 6, line 60-63], Drucker specifically teaches user ID,

password that allows user to access to the information, and also allows users to setup

for search criteria as detailed in col 4, line 27-35; 'upon authentication of said Internet

client, processing said request from said Internet client' [col 4, line 30-35, col 6,

line 63-67].


12.     As to Claim 6, Drucker teaches a system which including 'sending said printed

article comprises sending to an email address supplied by said Internet client' [col 6,

line 39-41].


13.     As to Claim 7, Drucker teaches a system which including 'connecting said

database to a telecommunication gateway, said gateway being adapted to transmit a

request from a Internet client to said database through a telecommunication network'

[col 15, line 21-32, fig 8, fig 12], telecommunication network corresponds to

communication interface coupling via network link connected to corresponding type of

telephone line as detailed in col 15, line 21-30].

14.     As to Claim 8, Drucker teaches a system which including 'upon pre-registering

said Internet client, collecting and storing an email address of said Internet client for

delivery' [col 8, line 55-62]; 'connecting said database to a telecommunication gateway,

said gateway being adapted to transmit a request from a Internet client to said database

through a telecommunication network' [col 15, line 21-32, fig 8, fig 12],

telecommunication network corresponds to communication interface coupling via

network link connected to corresponding type of telephone line as detailed in col 15,

line 21-30]; 'upon authenticating said Internet client, sending said printed article to said

email address of said Internet client previously collected' [col 6, line 39-41,

col 10, line 28-30].

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.     Claims 9,12,15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Drucker et al., [hereafter Drucker], US Patent No. 6292796 as applied to claim 1,10

above, and further in view of Loeb et al., [hereafter Loeb], US Patent No. 6014641.


16.     As to Claim 9, Drucker teaches a system which including 'name of publication,

author's anme, printed article's title' [see fig 2-3, fig 11, element 1104]. It is however,

noted that Drucker does not specifically 'assigning a default code, said default code

being published with said printed article when printed', although user can specifically

query for example Journals such as NEJM or JAMA with publication date(s)

[see col 11, line 25-30]. On the other hand Loeb disclosed 'assigning a default code,

said default code being published with said printed article when printed' [fig 3, element

254 specifically teaches magazine ID; fig 4, table containing magazine ID, Magazine

name, publisher ID data fields, also see fig 5-6, col 6, line 40-45, line 51-58].


It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Loeb et al., into improving access

to literature of Drucker et al., because both are directed to searching databases, more

specifically, Drucker is directed to accessing to literature such as medical, scientific

current affairs, law, dental database libraries [see Abstract], while Loeb is directed to

subscriptions to commodity items, more specifically open-ended subscription services

to customers to various magazines that including access to publisher database, order

and transaction [see Abstract].


One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have

been motivated to modify Drucker's reference to incorporate Loeb's fig 6 specifically

magazine database, publisher's information or publisher ID and Magazine ID

information because that would have allowed users of Drucker to control search query

specific article(s) related to specific publisher or from a specific Magazine, thus

improving the quality of subscription of various magazine subscriptions, wide selection

of magazines can be provided under a continuous service program as suggested by

Loeb  [col 11, line 49-51].


17.     As to Claim 12, Drucker teaches a system which including 'pre-registering each

Internet Client by collecting and storing information regarding delivery means, profile'

[fig 8,fig 11-12, col 8, line 35-41, line 58-62], Drucker specifically teaches Internet as

detailed in fig 12, col 15, line 53-59, delivery means corresponds to either by e-mail

message, facsimile and or like as detailed in col 8, line 58-62;'issuing to each Internet

client an access code to said database' [fig 11, element 1202], Drucker specifically

suggests userID, Password, setup info required to access database information [col 6,

line 52-61], upon receiving a request from said Internet client, authenticating said

Internet client' [col 6, line 56-61]. It is however, noted that Drucker does not specifically

teach 'payment methods'. On the other hand, Loeb disclosed 'payment methods' [fig 6,

see subscriber payment method as detailed in subscription record, col 8, line 17-21].

18.     As to Claim 13, Drucker disclosed 'connecting said at least one database to a

telecommunication gateway, said gateway being adapted to transmit a request with a

tag from a telecommunication client to said database' [col 15, line 21-32,fig 8,fig 12];

'upon authenticating said request from said telecommunication client, processing said

request' [col 4, line 29-31, col 6, line 60-61]; 'upon locating an printed article matching

said tag, transmitting said printed article to said telecommunication client based on

specified delivery means' [col 6, line 39-41, col 10, line 28-30].

19.     As to Claim 14, Drucker disclosed 'request is transmitted through a telephone

connection to said database and said reply is transmitted to said client's preregistered

email address' [col 6, line 39-41, col 8, line 35-46, line 53-62, col 15, line 24-32].

20.     As to Claim 15, Drucker teaches a system which including 'method of using the

Internet to retrieve and handle a plurality of printed article from a plurality of printed

publication for at least one entity customer, said entity customer providing a plurality of

Internet clients through said entity customer' [col 2, line 31-35,line 53-59, col 4, line 23-

26, fig 6C], internet to retrieve and handle printed article from a plurality of printed

publication corresponds to searching specific article or information from Internet

Grateful Med or IGM as detailed in col 2, line 31-35, line 53-59, customer corresponds

to user;' providing at least one printed article that is to be published in print' [col 3, line

27-31, col 4, line 8-12 line 23-26, fig 6C]; 'assigning said at least one printed article with

at least one tag' [col 4, line 32-44, col 8, line 37-52], printed article tags corresponds to

series of URLs; 'publishing each of said plurality of printed articles in print with its

corresponding tag' [col 6, line 16-38, col 8, line 37-52, fig 6C]; 'storing said plurality of

printed articles in at least one database, said at least one database being searchable

based on said at least one tag' [col 6, line 65-67, col 7, line 1-6, col 9, line 1-8];

'connecting said database to said Internet' [fig 8, fig 12, col 15, line 53-59],  database

corresponds to fig 8, element 518, Internet corresponds to fig 12, element

1225;'registering said entity customer by storing information, access rights criteria'

[col 6, line 56-63col 13, line 13-19]; 'receiving a request from an Internet client, said

request including said at least one tag' [col 3, line 27-32,  col 7, line 66-67, col 8,

line 1-5]; 'authenticating said Internet client to determine if said Internet client is allowed

by said entity customer' [col 6, line 60-62, col 13, line 13-17]'searching through said at

least one database to locate said printed article matching said at least one tag'  [col 8,

line 18-26]; 'upon locating said printed article, sending said printed article to   said

Internet client based on delivery method provided by said Internet client' [col 8, line 20-

22, line 37-41, line 58-59].  It is however, noted that Drucker does not specifically teach

payment methodology'.  On the other hand, Loeb disclosed '[fig 6, see subscriber

payment method as detailed in subscription record, col 8, line 17-21].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Loeb et al., into improving access to

literature of Drucker et al., because both are directed to searching databases, more

specifically, Drucker is directed to accessing to literature such as medical, scientific

current affairs, law, dental database libraries [see Abstract], while Loeb is directed to

subscriptions to commodity items, more specifically open-ended subscription services to

customers to various magazines that including access to publisher database, order and

transaction [see Abstract].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have

been motivated to modify Drucker's reference to incorporate Loeb's fig 6 specifically

subscriber payment method and related customer or subscriber information as detailed

in publisher #1 subscription record because that would have allowed users of Drucker

not only control search query specific article(s) related to specific publisher or from a

specific Magazine, but also tracks customer payment criteria, thus improving the

quality of subscription of various magazine subscriptions, wide selection of magazines

can be provided under a continuous service program as suggested by Loeb [col 11,

line 49-51].

21.    As to Claim 16, Drucker disclosed 'access rights criteria comprises granting

rights to those Internet clients matching predetermined criteria identified by said entity

customer' [col 4, line 27-35, col 6, line 60-63], on the other hand, Loeb disclosed

'payment methodology comprises user fee based' [col 8, line 17-21, line 42-45].


22.    As to Claim 17, Drucker disclosed ' delivery method comprises only delivering

said printed article to said entity customer's designated mailbox' [col 6, line 39-41, col 8,

line 35-46, line 53-62].


23.    Claims 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Drucker et al., [hereafter Drucker], US Patent No. 6292796, Loeb et al., [hereafter

Loeb], US Patent No. 6014641 as applied to claim 15   above, and further in view of

Walker et al., [hereafter Walker], US Patent No. 6449616.


24.    As to Claim 18, both Drucker and Loeb do not specifically teach 'commercial

advertisement supplied by an advertiser, collecting a fee from said advertiser', although

Loeb suggests subscribe published magazine, and subscriber payment method as

detailed in fig 6.  On the other hand, Walker disclosed "commercial advertisement

supplied by an advertiser, collecting a fee from said advertiser' [col 4, line 8-16].


It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Walker et al. into improving access

to literature of Drucker et al.,, open ended subscriptions to commodity items normally

available only through term based subscriptions of Loeb et al., because they are all

directed to searching electronic databases, more specifically, Drucker is directed to

accessing to literature such as medical, scientific current affairs, law, dental database

libraries [see Abstract], while Loeb is directed to subscriptions to commodity items,

more specifically open-ended subscription services to customers to various magazines

that including access to publisher database, order and transaction [see Abstract],

Walker is directed to distributing supplemental information related to printed articles,

more specifically electronic databases containing the supplemental information or third

party intermediates handling requests for supplemental information [see abstract].


One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have

been motivated to combine the references because that would have allowed users of

Drucker, Loeb to allow publishers to have related supplemental information included in

the respective printed articles because users may benefit further interesting events

/topics or articles or books related to the published articles thus improving the quality of

advertisement related to printed articles, also generate revenue for customers and the

publishers [col 2, line 59-67].

### *Response to Arguments*

25.    Applicant's arguments filed on 8/2/2004 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:


a)    At page 8, item 14, claims 1-19, applicant argues that "Drucker is more about

"researching" databases for articles in the electronic regime, whereas the present

invention is related to "retrieving an article that has already been read, in hardcopy by

the readers"


As to the above argument [a], Drucker specifically teaches accessing and filter

libraries of literature using computer system, it is also noted that libraries may also have

hardcopy books containing articles, newspaper reviews, or collection of various articles

on a specific subject and like, furthermore, Drucker also teaches retrieving information

such as journals, newspapers, textbooks and like as detailed in col 4, line 27-35.


b)    At page 8, item 14, claims 1-19, applicant argues that "A user of Drucker's may

not result in HITS, whereas a reader using the present invention always retrieves the

article.....


As to the above argument [b], Examiner disagree with the applicant because

Drucker specifically teaches user has the ability to search or query or specify search

query as detailed in fig 4, col 7, line 66-67, col 8, line 1-5, furthermore, user has the

ability to specify type of information may be described or query using natural language [col 7, line 49-51], therefore, Drucker not only teaches searching databases, but also allows to filter to specific information for example as detailed inn fig 4.

c)    At page 9, item 15, claims 1-19, applicant argues that Moreover, the auricles in Drucker are not printed with any pre-assigned unique tag in a printed publication. Drucker only discloses an electronic access, search and display system, without mention of a "a printed article".....

As to the above argument [c], examiner disagree with the applicant because Drucker specifically teaches not only accessing, searching, displaying of the articles, but also provides additional functionality for example save search, save, email, print as detailed in fig 6C, therefore, viewing or displaying, assigning specific url tag that locating the specific information such as title, abstract, full text and like is integral part of Drucker's teaching [see col 8, line 43-52, fig 6c].

d)    At page 9, item 17-18, claims 1-19, applicant argues, "there is also no teaching of Drucker's articles being printed in publication with the unique tag"

e)    At page 10, item 22-23, claims 1-19, applicant argues that "Drucker's searchs do not include any tag that is uniquely associated and printed with the article"

As to the above argument [d-e], as best understood by the examiner, Drucker specifically teaches URLs or unique tag to locate the specific information in this case either full description of the article, or abstract or bibliographic information and like as detailed in col 8, line 37-62, furthermore, it is noted that these articles or information are being published in a text books, journals, or newspapers, therefore, Druckers articles being published in publication and assigned a unique tag to locate specific information.

f)      At page 9, item 19-20, claims 1-19, applicant argues that "no mention of any publishing of the article in print with the tag, before a search is conducted is described by Druker, here or anywhere in Drucker.

As to the above argument [f], as explained above, Drucker teaches locating specific information using URLs that corresponds to unique tag for accessing the information, further Drucker also teaches additional functions save, save search, email and print, as detailed in col 8, line 37-62, fig 6C, furthermore, the information may be already published information for example medical journals, biomedical research journals, textbooks, guidelines, newspapers, and/or magazines as detailed in col 6, line 3-6

g)      At page 10, item 21, claim 9, applicant argues "Drucker does not specifically

assign a default code, said default code being published with said printed article when

printed"


As to the above argument [g], with respective to claim 9, in the previous office

action, examiner noted that Drucker does not specifically assigning a default code,

although user can specifically query specific information for example journals like NEJM

or JAMA [see col 11, line 25-30].  On the other hand, Loeb disclosed 'assigning a

default code, said default code being published with said printed article when printed'

[see Loeb: fig 3, element 254] specifically magazine ID, magazine name, publisher ID,

data fields and like [see fig 5-6, col 6, line 40-45,line 51-58].


h)      At page 10, item 25-26, claims 1-19, applicant argues, "Drucker's search is a

search of all relevant databases based on the query entered by its user.  This is quite

an arduous task, since the query must be conducted on each and every literature in the

databases.  On the other hand, the present invention only looks for the tag, which is

already provided by the printed article and observed by the reader.


As to the above argument, as best understood by the examiner, Drucker

specifically teaches searching, filtering required information, further, user searched

records may have one or more related articles or information via relationship

[see col 13, line 30-34], Drucker also teaches a table that contain unique identifier or

key to identify specific record and related article information, or journal and location

[URLs} as detailed in col 13, line 18-22, therefore, at minimum, Drucker also teaches

tag that provides specific location and unique information.


Examiner applies above discussed arguments to dependent claims 2-8, 11.


I)      At page 11, claims 9,12,15-17, applicant argues that there was thus no

motivation for someone skilled in the art to modify Drucker to incorporate Loeb's

feature, since such modification would not have improved Drucker's search query.


26.      In response to applicant's argument [i] that there is no suggestion to combine the

references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art.  See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re*

*Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).  In this case, Drucker et al. is

directed to improving access to literature, more specifically access mechanism that

searches present and past journal publications, newspapers, and /or other articles [see

Abstract], furthermore, user may specifically issue search criteria or filter to specific

information, users can select one or more articles, or citations to view, save, save as,

print [see col 6, line 45-51, fig 6c].  It is however, noted in the office action that Drucker

does not specifically teach assigning a default code, for published article, although, Drucker specifically teaches articles may be assigned with unique identifier or tag to identify specific information and location [col 8, line 37-62]. On the other hand, Loeb specifically teaches assigning default code for printed articles as detailed in fig 3, assigning a default code corresponds to magazine ID, publisher ID and like as detailed in fig 5-6, col 6, line 40-45, line 51-58. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine these references because both Drucker, Loeb are directed to accessing to information such as medical, scientific, medical, law and database libraries [see Drucker et al: Abstract, Loeb: Abstract, col 3, line 7-15], it is also noted that Loeb also directed to customer subscription, renewals of magazines, and related transactions [see fig 2].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to combine the references because that would have allowed users of Drucker, Loeb to allow publishers to have related supplemental information included in the respective printed articles because users may benefit further interesting events /topics or articles or books related to the published articles thus improving the quality of advertisement related to printed articles, also generate revenue for customers and the publishers [col 2, line 59-67].


Examiner applies above arguments to dependent claim 18.

27.    **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action.  In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

## *Conclusion*

## The prior art made of record

a. US Patent No. 6292796

b. US Patent No 6014641

c. US Patent No. 6449616

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

d. US Patent No. 6704739

e. US Patent No. 6549956

f. US Patent No. 6546406

g. US Patent No. 6148331

h. US Patent No. 6389541

i. US Patent No 6253188

j. US Patent No 2001/0047362

k. US Patent No 2002/0049781

l. EP0775962A2

m. EP1160693

n. EP1158424A1

o. GB2368423

p. GB2328300

q.      WO 00/70436


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-

272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to

5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dov Popvici, can be reached on 571-272-.4083. The fax phone numbers for

the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 703/872-9306

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)


sc
*Patent Examiner.*
December 27, 2004.

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER